

Second Aggregate Report on Offender Management in Prisons

*Findings from a Series of Joint Inspections by
HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons*

July 2012

Second Aggregate Report on Offender Management in Prisons.

**Findings from a Series of Joint
Inspections by
HM Inspectorate of Probation and
HM Inspectorate of Prisons**

ISBN: 978-1-84099-551-0

2012

Foreword

This report is the second to be published from our joint Prison Offender Management Inspection programme, in which we have examined how well work with prisoners is being carried out during their time in custody.

The assumption underlying the criminal justice system is that imprisonment should not only punish those who have offended by containing them, and thereby provide some form of deterrence to others whilst at the same time protecting the wider community, but also reform them. In order to achieve this, work with individual prisoners needs to address effectively their attitudes, behaviour and lifestyle.

We were disappointed to find that, with some notable exceptions, this is not happening to any meaningful extent.

Our inspections found that many prisons paid good attention to the 'resettlement' needs of the prisoner, i.e. their personal and social circumstances including education, employment, health etc. Such work plays an important part in reducing the likelihood of reoffending on release, but needs to be underpinned by work which encourages and sustains changes in attitudes and behaviour. There are still insufficient places across the prison estate on accredited programmes which deal with thoughts and attitudes. As a result some prisoners, notably sex offenders, are not always able to access the treatment programmes they need to change their behaviour before they are released.

We saw many committed staff in Offender Management Units in prisons who clearly wanted to work effectively with individual prisoners and were frustrated when deployed to other duties because of operational demands. There was insufficient guidance about their role and some felt inadequately trained. Professional supervision by line managers is not generally a part of the prison culture and oversight of work with individual cases, even the most serious, was limited. Although we found some examples of good public protection work, we were concerned that, overall, the work on both public protection and child protection issues was not of a sufficient standard. Too often the separation of offender management and public protection functions within the prison meant that information critical to public protection did not inform offender management decisions.

Given the lack of priority afforded to offender management work it was not surprising to find that prison staff outside the Offender Management Unit had little appreciation of its work. The electronic case record P-NOMIS has the capacity to address some of our concerns by capturing and communicating information about an individual prisoner, including their progress towards achieving sentence plan objectives. However, despite the investment in the roll-out of the system, it was not being used effectively to support offender management.

Sentence plans were generally inadequate. Too often they were based on the interventions that were available rather than on what were required. This has had the effect of masking the true level of need across the prison estate. Objectives were rarely outcome focused, so it was not surprising that progress and change were insufficiently recorded. These failings raise problems for offender managers in the community, as well

as staff in prisons, as they are responsible for preparing risk assessments to inform progress through the prison system and ultimately release.

A period of incarceration offers an opportunity to tackle a prisoner's entrenched behaviour and attitudes, and moreover to observe and capture on a day-to-day basis whether the necessary changes are taking place prior to release. Failing to capitalise on that opportunity is a waste of an expensive resource.

LIZ CALDERBANK

HM Chief Inspector of Probation

March 2012

NICK HARDWICK

HM Chief Inspector of Prisons

Contents

	Page
Foreword	4
Contents	6
Acknowledgements	7
Executive Summary	8
Recommendations	12
1. Offender Management and the Prison Offender Management Inspection	13
2. Offender Management in Custodial Establishments	15
3. Offender Management in Practice – Assessment and sentence planning	23
4. Offender Management in Practice – Delivering the sentence	29
Glossary	34
Appendix	36

Acknowledgements

This report draws on the findings from inspections undertaken between June and November 2011. We would like to express our thanks to staff and managers at the following H.M. Prison establishments: Deerbolt; Durham; East Sutton Park; High Down; Isis; Low Newton; Maidstone; Rye Hill; Shrewsbury; Stafford; and Wayland.

HM Lead Inspector:	Steve Woodgate
HM Inspectors of Probation:	Helen Davies; Paddy Doyle; Martyn Griffiths; Keith Humphreys; Martin Jolly; Iolo Madoc-Jones; Yvonne McGuckian; Eileen O'Sullivan; Ian Simpkins; Joseph Simpson; Les Smith
HMI Probation Practice Assessors:	Ian Cavanagh; Stephen Hubbard; Helen Morton; Chris Simpson; Cliff Warke
HM Inspectors of Prisons:	Joss Crosbie; Martin Kettle; Keith McInnis; Kellie Reeve; Andrew Rooke; Paul Rowlands
HMI Prisons Research Team:	Sam Booth; Michael Skidmore
Inspection Support Team:	Andy Doyle
Information Team:	Kevin Ball; Stephen Hunt, Oliver Kenton
Publications Team:	Alex Pentecost; Christopher Reeves
HM Assistant Chief Inspector	Sally Lester

July 2012

Executive Summary

The Offender Management Model

The NOMS Offender Management Model is designed to provide a framework within which sentenced adults are managed through their custodial or community sentence by an offender manager based in the community. The role of the offender manager is to make an assessment of the individual, to produce a sentence plan based on this assessment and to work closely both with those delivering interventions and with offender supervisors based in prisons. Interventions, including both accredited and non-accredited programmes designed to change attitudes and behaviour, are intended to play an important role in the work with an offender.

By adopting an end-to-end approach to offender management, the model sets out to ensure that individual offenders serve their sentence, whilst also promoting changes in their behaviour to make them less likely to reoffend. Where offenders present a Risk of Harm to others, the work of those agencies involved should manage and reduce this risk.

The Offender Management Model covers several categories of prisoner: adults serving 12 months and over who are classified as posing a high or very high Risk of Serious Harm to the public; Prolific and Other Priority Offenders; those serving indeterminate periods of imprisonment for public protection; and young adult offenders serving more than four weeks. These prisoners are described as being 'in scope' of the model.

Plans are currently underway for all prisoners to be assessed and then allocated to different levels of offender management depending on that assessment. Offender management tasks and responsibilities will be transferred to offender supervisors in Offender Management Units, with offender managers in the community becoming involved prior to release. The tiering framework, initially only for community providers, is being extended to cover custody. As a result, all sentenced prisoners will be allocated a tier, based on identified Risk of Harm to others and likelihood of reoffending. This will support the principle of 'resources follow risk' when working with people who have offended.

The Strategic Leadership of Offender Management

In 2010 we published our first aggregate report, *Prison Offender Management: A Joined-Up Sentence?* which covered the 13 prisons we inspected in 2009/2010. We found that Offender Management Units had been established in all these prisons, but there was a wide variation in their role, importance and profile within the establishment; this remained the case in the establishments inspected for this report in 2011. Whilst in some prisons, there was a strong strategic lead on offender management, and the Offender Management Unit was seen as an integral part of the establishment's role in public protection and reducing reoffending, in others it was regarded as primarily concerned with resettlement activity.

The extent of the Offender Management Unit's role was thereby limited to the practical arrangements for release rather than matters of public protection and how the prisoner might best be managed in prison and in the community. If establishments are to ensure that prisoners leave custody less likely to reoffend than when they started their sentence,

prison and probation staff need to have a dual focus: firstly on the appropriateness of the post-release arrangements; secondly on the work that is done during the sentence to change the offender's attitudes and behaviour.

In our recent inspections, we found a continuing lack of understanding about the work of the offender supervisors and, as a result, Offender Management Unit staff were often not involved in significant decisions, such as classification, or were not included in key information sharing meetings. This also affected the commitment of other departments to contribute to sentence planning. The role of personal/named officers, particularly in relation to offender supervisors was often unclear. Where the Offender Management Unit did not occupy a central role within the prison, it was difficult to see how it could provide the necessary structure to manage offenders through their prison sentence into the community as intended by the Offender Management Model.

In our last report we noted that prison officers had received little training that would prepare them for the offender supervisor role. Some training had been developed and delivered, but we found that some staff still lacked confidence in their role. They consequently felt inadequately equipped to interview prisoners effectively and to produce analysis and assessment, particularly in more complex cases. Many had received insufficient guidance on their role. Whilst line managers were required to meet with staff for reviews and appraisals, 'supervision' in the sense of professional discussion about cases, was not part of the prison culture. There was therefore little evidence of management oversight of work with individuals classified as High or Very High Risk of Serious Harm, so offender supervisors were both denied the opportunity for support in managing such difficult cases and were not held to account for doing so. Such supervision is considered essential by probation trusts.

The separation of offender management and public protection functions in some prisons resulted in information critical to public protection being held in different places. This meant that important elements of prisoners' lives were managed and recorded in a fragmented way, with unnecessary duplication of effort and waste of staff resources and potential loss of information.

The electronic case recording system, P-NOMIS, has the capacity to address these concerns, by facilitating communication between prison departments and recording information important to the management of individual prisoners and the delivery of their sentence plans. We were therefore surprised to find that despite the investment in the roll-out of P-NOMIS across the public prison service estate, in many prisons its use to support offender management was still minimal. A significant culture shift was required for the necessary change to be achieved. The effective use of P-NOMIS as a means of recording and communication needed to form part of the professional expectations and training for staff and not simply an exercise in IT training.

Whilst most prisons were analysing the needs of their prisoner population, some analyses were out of date and others had been done but were not used to inform the provision of interventions. OASys data was rarely used to analyse prisoner need. As a result, it was unclear how the establishment determined which interventions to provide for their population.

Most, but not all, establishments ran a general offending behaviour programme and some provided other programmes in addition. However, most prisons did not have the capacity to meet prisoner demand for accredited programmes in terms of either frequency of delivery or the number of places available, or both. We were particularly concerned about the

inadequate availability of Sex Offender Treatment Programmes in those prisons which housed a large number of sex offenders. A number of these prisoners had not had the opportunity to complete the programmes necessary to reduce their risk. This appeared to be a widespread problem and, as such, it is an issue for NOMS, rather than for individual establishments.

Offender Management in Practice – Assessment and Sentence Planning

Assessments and plans were generally completed, with many offender managers contributing to sentence planning boards. Nevertheless, in most cases, there was little sense of offender managers driving the work with the prisoner during the custodial sentence, in the way envisaged by the Offender Management Model. The planned transfer of responsibility for assessment and planning to offender supervisors may be a pragmatic response to this reality – but it is one which needs to be matched by appropriate focus on the training of offender supervisors and the resources available to them.

Sentence plans were based on outcome-focused objectives in too few cases. There needed to be a shift from process driven targets (e.g. 'complete programme') to objectives formulated around the required changes in behaviour, attitudes and lifestyle (e.g. 'to be able to control temper better').

In some prisons, duplicate sentence planning processes ran in parallel, with staff in various departments contributing to different plans rather than making a single, timely contribution to one properly integrated plan. This was both wasteful and confusing. A change of approach was needed to put the OASys sentence plan at the core of the work with the prisoner, with the contributions of the various prison departments incorporated into a single, overarching plan.

We did not see any evidence in records that OASys was used to inform decision-making about categorisation or allocation, or specifically reviewed as part of the decision-making process for transfer to open conditions in relevant cases.

Offender Management in Practice – Delivering the sentence

Notwithstanding our previous comments, some offender supervisors had a clear overview of the case and were directing the work being undertaken. Many staff worked hard to support the aims of the Offender Management Model. Offender supervisors and others showed commitment to their role by motivating and supporting prisoners and reinforcing positive changes in behaviour. However, whilst commendable, this in itself was not sufficient. As we have already observed, in too many cases, the appropriate interventions were not available, and the work with the prisoner was based on the available programmes, rather than on the assessment. As such, it was less likely to achieve the necessary change in behaviour.

Some prisons had recognised the gaps in accredited programmes and sought to provide non-accredited alternatives, usually through education provision. It was recognised by the prisons that these interventions were not a direct equivalent and that offenders might still need to undertake the accredited version at a later date.

Consequently, whilst some progress had been made towards achieving sentence plan objectives in the majority of cases seen, insufficient progress had been made in half of those inspected on the most significant offending-related factors.

Prisoners who met the criteria to be managed through the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) were actively identified and in most (though not all) prisons we found a good inter-departmental approach to risk management. Multi-agency child protection procedures were used effectively to manage child protection in three-quarters of cases. Changes in the prisoner's Risk of Harm to others were generally identified and acted upon, but the assessment was not always reviewed and updated as required.

Conclusion

These findings are addressed more fully in the report and inform our recommendations.

Recommendations

We recommend that the National Offender Management Service:

- undertakes a review of prisoner need across the custodial estate, and ensures that the range and number of accredited programmes and other interventions intended to reduce the risk of reoffending match and meet the needs of the prisoner population
- ensures that prisoners are able to access the interventions they need to address their offending and that this issue is also taken into account when allocating prisoners to appropriate prison establishments.

We further recommend that the National Offender Management Service works with custodial establishments and providers of probation services to ensure that:

- Offender Management Units occupy a central place within the management and operational structure of prisons, and are fully integrated into their overall function and work
- the role of the offender supervisor in offender management is clarified, and supported by appropriate training and regular supervision of professional and casework skills by managers
- every prisoner has a single overarching outcome-focused sentence plan that identifies the changes in attitude, behaviour and lifestyle required to reduce their Risk of Harm to others and likelihood of reoffending. This plan should be informed by contributions from all relevant departments in the prison
- assessments and sentence plans are reviewed where there has been a significant change in the likelihood of reoffending, or in the level of Risk of Harm posed by the offender
- more effective use is made of P-NOMIS to ensure that all significant contact and communication about each prisoner is recorded in a single record and made available to any subsequent prisons following a transfer. Furthermore, this single record should contain copies of all assessments undertaken and details of interventions delivered, and be made available to the offender manager.

1. Offender Management and the Prison Offender Management Inspection

Inspecting offender management in custodial establishments

- 1.1. HMI Prisons provides independent inspection of places of detention to report on the treatment of prisoners and the conditions in which they are held, and promote positive outcomes for those detained and the public. As part of these inspections, HMI Probation inspects the quality of service delivered to a sample of individual offenders to prevent reoffending and protect the public from harm. The Prison Offender Management Inspections are based on both the *Expectations* set by HMI Prisons and the *Criteria* used by HMI Probation in the Offender Management Inspection programme. HMI Probation has joined HMI Prisons' teams in every full announced prison inspection since September 2009.
- 1.2. As part of these inspections, both inspectorates receive evidence in advance (including prisoner survey data collected by HMI Prisons), undertake an assessment of a small sample of prisoners and hold meetings with Offender Management Unit leaders and staff. From June 2011 the methodology for these inspections was expanded to include an interview with the offender supervisor allocated to each of the prisoners in the sample. At the same time the sample changed to incorporate only those cases 'in scope' of the Offender Management Model¹.
- 1.3. HMI Probation findings are incorporated in the *Resettlement* section of the published HMI Prisons report for each institution. In addition, where ten or more prisoners in a sample are from one Probation Trust, HMI Probation sends a more detailed findings letter to that Trust. Five such letters were produced during the period covered by this report. In the other inspections conducted during this period, the cases we examined were from a range of Probation Trusts. Few were from the immediate locality – a reflection of the limited alignment between prisoners' home areas and their location within the prison system.
- 1.4. The first report from the joint Prison Offender Management Inspection programme, *Prison Offender Management: A Joined-Up Sentence?* was published in March 2011 and reflected findings from the first 13 establishments inspected. The report was based on the data from case file reading, prisoner survey data, findings presented earlier to HMI Prisons and findings' letters sent to Probation Trusts. It covered both 'in scope' and 'out of scope' cases.
- 1.5. This second report covers the first 11 prisons inspected from June 2011. The inspections are based on the same general criteria as those on which we reported in March 2011. However, some inspection questions were adapted or expanded to maximise the additional benefit of interviewing offender supervisors. Because of

¹ Those defined as 'in scope' of the Offender management Model are: adults serving 12 months and over who are classified as posing a high or very high risk of serious harm to the public; Prolific and Other Priority Offenders; those serving indeterminate periods of imprisonment for public protection and young adult offenders serving more than four weeks.

this, and the changes in our case sample to only 'in scope' cases, we can make only general comparisons with previous findings.

- 1.6. This report relates to our inspections of HMP establishments: Deerbolt, Durham, East Sutton Park, High Down, Isis, Low Newton, Maidstone, Rye Hill, Shrewsbury, Stafford and Wayland. During the course of these inspections, we assessed 220 cases 'in scope' of offender management, 20 at each prison.

2. Offender Management in Custodial Establishments

Summary

This section examines the findings related to the strategic leadership of offender management in custody.

Key findings:

- The role of the Offender Management Unit within each establishment varied widely, as did its importance and profile. In some, the unit was seen as an integral part of the prison's role in public protection and reducing reoffending; in others the profile of the unit was low and other staff were unclear about its purpose.
- Most prisons identified MAPPA cases and held internal reviews. Some prisons also ensured representation on MAPPA meetings held in the community. This was good practice.
- Although P-NOMIS had been rolled out, there had been little consideration of how to use it effectively as a single case record to communicate and record information about individual prisoners. Moreover, in some prisons, the separation of offender management and public protection functions resulted in significant information being held separately in different places.
- Sentence planning processes were duplicated in some prisons: this practice was both wasteful and confusing.
- Whilst offender supervisors were enthusiastic, some felt inadequately trained. There was insufficient guidance about their role and it was unclear how it fitted with the role of the personal/named officer. Few offender supervisors received regular supervision from their line managers and there was insufficient oversight of their work with prisoners who were assessed as presenting a High Risk of Serious Harm to others.
- Whilst most prisons were analysing the needs of their prisoner population, some analyses were out of date and others were not used to inform the provision of interventions. OASys data was rarely used to analyse prisoner need.
- Accredited programme capacity was insufficient to meet the full range and level of prisoner need. This included some sex offenders who were unable to access the programme they needed to reduce their Risk of Harm to others.

The strategic leadership of offender management

- 2.1 As in our previous inspections, we found a considerable variation in the role, importance and profile of the Offender Management Unit within each establishment. It remained the case that in some establishments offender management was regarded primarily as being concerned with the prisoner's resettlement in the community following release, rather than with the management of their whole sentence, including a focus on work, whilst still in custody, to reduce their likelihood of reoffending and to minimise their Risk of Harm to others. Offender management needs to encompass both these aspects if work to ensure that offenders lead a law abiding life on release is to be effective.
- 2.2 In contrast, in some prisons we found a strong strategic lead on offender management, where the unit and its head were integrated into the wider functions of the establishment. For example, at HMP High Down the Senior Management Team shared a common vision of the aspirations for prison in the context of the payment by results agenda. They recognised that the Offender Management Unit would play a crucial role to the contribution made by the prison to reducing the likelihood of reoffending and managing the Risk of Harm posed by prisoners. The Offender Management Unit and the units responsible for the delivery of interventions were all managed by the Head of Reducing Reoffending. The Offender Management Unit policy was supported by an Offender Management Unit team plan developed by the local (Surrey & Sussex) Probation Trust. This mapped out how the Offender Management Unit team would support the delivery of the Probation Trust Business Plan and also meet the requirements of HMP High Down.
- 2.3 At HMP/YOI Isis, which at the time of the inspection had been open for just over a year, responsibilities for public protection, resettlement and offender management were shared at senior management level. However, the different units involved in delivering these functions needed to communicate more effectively for the full benefits of the system to be realised.
- 2.4 Where Offender Management Units did not occupy a central role, it was not surprising to find that offender supervisors said that their colleagues in other departments did not understand their work. This meant that Offender Management Unit staff were not involved in key elements of the prisoner's experience, such as induction or decisions about classification where they could have made a relevant contribution.
- 2.5 Whilst the P-NOMIS electronic case database had been rolled out to all public sector prisons, in most establishments little consideration had been given to what needed to be recorded, and by whom. Much important information about the management of prisoners and the delivery of their sentence plans was not held on P-NOMIS and therefore not readily available to be shared between offender supervisors and offender managers.
- 2.6 The continuing separation of offender management and public protection in some establishments meant that information about public protection matters (for example, Security Information Reports) was sometimes held in a different part of the prison. As a result, critical information, for example, about conduct within the prison that might demonstrate progress and change or, conversely, offence-

paralleling behaviour, was not available to those charged with delivering interventions and preparing prisoners for safe release into the community. This lack of integration of offender management and public protection remains of concern.

The structure and make up of Offender Management Units

- 2.7 Offender supervisors continued to be a mixture of prison officers and seconded probation staff (both probation officers and probation service officers). In Offender Management Units with both prison officer and probation staff, complex cases or those posing the greatest Risk of Harm to others (such as MAPPA cases and indeterminate sentence prisoners) were usually allocated to probation staff, irrespective of whether the cases were 'in scope' or 'out of scope'; this was a sensible approach, making best use of their particular skills.
- 2.8 In practice, allocation was also determined by pragmatic considerations, such as variations in the numbers of different types of prisoner and the actual ratio of different types of Offender Management Unit staff. In most institutions, prison officers periodically needed to be allocated to other operational duties, leaving little time for acting as offender supervisor. Where this happened to any significant degree, there appeared to be lower levels of contact between the offender supervisor and the prisoner.
- 2.9 In our last report we noted that prison officers had received little training that would prepare them for the offender supervisor role. They had received training in how to complete the OASys documentation, and we understand that the OASys training programme also covered interviewing and the analysis of information. However, in this set of inspections, we found that some offender supervisors still lacked confidence in their role. They felt that their training had not equipped them to support assessment and planning in more complex cases, particularly in relation to the interviewing skills needed to elicit the information in the first place. Some lacked the ability to analyse the information they had gathered, or to use it to support the production of sentence plans and risk management plans. Many offender supervisors had received insufficient guidance on what they were meant to do in their contact with the offender. This was a matter of particular concern, given the forthcoming transfer of responsibility for assessment and planning from offender managers to offender supervisors.
- 2.10 We regard this lack of training and guidance as a strategic issue. Most of the offender supervisors we interviewed were enthusiastic about the potential of their role but felt that it was undervalued. The majority engaged positively with the inspection and were keen to talk about their work and ways of developing their role.
- 2.11 Since the introduction of offender management, the role of personal/named officers had become unclear in some establishments. Wing files often contained entries about day-to-day activities and contact between wing staff and the prisoner. In some, the offender supervisor was not identified and no reference was made to sentence plan targets, thereby reducing the opportunity for the work of the personal/named officer to enhance that of the offender supervisor. In others there was a clearer delineation of roles, and the personal/named officer was able to make a separate and distinct contribution to work with the prisoner.

- 2.12 We found few structured or routine links between the prisons and their local Probation Trusts; such links could help to support offender supervisor practice and skills development. However, we were pleased to note that at HMP/YOI Isis resources had been found to provide offender supervisors with remote access to the local (London) Probation Trust's case management system (Delius) from the prison. This meant that offender supervisors could access the case records kept by offender managers in the community. They could also add entries on Delius themselves. This enabled offender supervisors to communicate and share information on Delius on an ongoing basis with the offender manager and vice versa.
- 2.13 We interviewed 178 offender supervisors throughout the 11 inspections. More than three-quarters felt their line managers were appropriately skilled to support them in their work, and received line management oversight. However, half of them only had formal supervision every six months or less and 40% did not think that supervision had promoted improvements in their practice. Regular professional (line management) supervision does not appear to be part of prison culture and yet is considered essential by Probation Trusts, both to support staff in dealing with high risk cases and to hold them to account for their actions. In our current programme of Offender Management Inspection in the community 73% of 2,640 offender managers receive supervision at least every six weeks and most describe the experience as valuable.

Public protection arrangements

- 2.14 As previously indicated, public protection arrangements varied between prisons. Responsibility for public protection was sometimes located within the Offender Management Unit, and sometimes within a public protection unit managed separately within a reducing reoffending department. At HMP Durham a team of probation staff formed the public protection unit, which was managed by the head of offender management. They were responsible for public protection procedures, work with life sentence prisoners and those serving public protection sentences or subject to MAPPA. There were close links with the Offender Management Unit, and the probation officers in the team were responsible for checking OASys produced by offender supervisors.
- 2.15 Most prisons had arrangements in place to ensure that MAPPA eligible cases were identified on arrival and notified or referred as appropriate. This function was usually located within the Offender Management Unit. Typically an inter-departmental risk management team met monthly but sometimes more often. At HMP Wayland, for example, the team met monthly and additionally as required. It reviewed MAPPA Level 2 and 3 cases due for release within three months, plus other cases referred by a risk assessment group. The latter screened all arriving prisoners who were MAPPA eligible, and other cases if referred by an offender supervisor due to particular concerns.
- 2.16 It was disappointing to find in other prisons that the central role of offender management in public protection was frustrated by organisational arrangements. One such example was at HMP Rye Hill where a monthly inter-department risk management team meeting was poorly attended and there were concerns about the lack of attendance by the security department. However, there was a monthly

security committee meeting at which attendance by most departments was mandatory, but staff from the Offender Management Unit were not invited. Information sharing between most sections of the prison and the Offender Management Unit was limited, thereby impeding effective offender management.

- 2.17 All such systems were of course dependent on the prison having full information about the prisoner. Most had made arrangements for dealing with prisoners arriving between regular meetings where these were held less than weekly. In many prisons, such meetings were attended by staff representing all key departments. In some, such as HMP/YOI Isis it was policy for the Offender Management Unit to be represented at any relevant MAPPA meetings in the community. Such practice is to be welcomed as it supports the concept of end-to-end offender management and ensures that relevant information – particularly about the prisoner’s Risk of Harm to others - is communicated to all relevant parties.
- 2.18 Records of risk management meetings and MAPPA meetings were not always copied to Offender Management Unit case files, although in some cases they were available to offender supervisors as they were held electronically on a shared drive.

Recording offender management

- 2.19 P-NOMIS provided an electronic case record and contact log that could potentially be accessed by all staff within the prison and thus avoid fragmentation of records, poor communication between departments, and the wasteful duplication of records and plans. By the time of these inspections P-NOMIS and its supporting training had been rolled out to all public sector prisons but, despite this investment, nowhere did we find its full functionality being used to support offender management. In our opinion, this represented a missed opportunity which would have addressed many of our concerns about the quality of information exchange.
- 2.20 We found that whilst staff had had the necessary ‘technical’ training in P-NOMIS, they sometimes lacked confidence in its use or sufficient access to terminals to use the system routinely. Many prison staff did not see the need to record much information or to share it with others. As a result, prisons were not always making use of all the available information to inform decisions about prison allocation, re-categorisation or planning for eventual release. This not only wasted the time of those who needed information and had to search for it, but significant information did not always reach those who needed it.

Analysis of prisoner needs

- 2.21 We previously reported that none of the prisons we had visited were using OASys data as a source of evidence about prisoners’ needs and offending-related factors. We recommended that prisons make better strategic use of OASys and other assessments in their analysis of the prisoner population, in order to enable the profile of accredited programmes and other interventions to match the identified needs.

- 2.22 In the recent inspections we found that most of the prisons were using an analysis of prisoner need to inform their planning, although the basis of these analyses varied, and some were out of date, whilst others had been completed but were not being used to inform the delivery of interventions. There was no use of such analyses, either by individual prisons or regionally, to check the appropriateness of transfers into the prison, or that prisoner selection on the basis of needs was effective. In most prisons we saw little evidence of prisoners' views being used to inform planning.
- 2.23 At HMP High Down, a full prisoner needs analysis based on OASys data had been conducted in 2009, and had subsequently been reviewed and updated in 2010 and 2011. It had been used to commission specific interventions such as a 'living on licence' programme. We thought that this was good practice.
- 2.24 At HMP Wayland, a prisoner needs analysis had been conducted in 2010 and a larger and more in depth analysis was planned for later in 2011. Some managers suggested that an establishment needs analysis was unnecessary because prisoners were selected for HMP Wayland (and the services it offered) on the basis of their individual assessments. However, the majority of the cases inspected did not have a current OASys assessment at the time they transferred into the prison to confirm their needs matched the range of services provided.

Provision of accredited and non-accredited programmes

- 2.25 In our previous inspections we found that the level of accredited programmes provided did not meet the identified needs of sentenced offenders overall; this remained the case.
- 2.26 In this inspection, we found that most establishments had access to a general offending behaviour programme, and some prisons provided one or more other programmes in addition. However, in most of the prisons accredited programme capacity was insufficient to meet the full range and level of prisoner need, in terms of either frequency of delivery, number of places available, or both. We were concerned that a number of sex offenders had not had the opportunity to complete the programmes they needed to reduce their risk prior to release. Of the 178 offender supervisors we met, 54% thought they did not have access to sufficient resources to deliver sentence plans. By contrast in our current programme of Offender Management Inspection in the community of 2,630 offender managers, 33% thought they did not have access to sufficient resources to deliver sentence plans.
- 2.27 Within these overall limitations in programme capacity, we found wide variations in their availability between the prisons inspected. For example, HMP Stafford provided 178 places annually divided between the Thinking Skills Programme (TSP), Building Skills for Recovery (formerly Prisons Addressing Substance Related Offending - PASRO), Alcohol Related Violence and Sex Offender Treatment Programme (SOTP). HMP Shrewsbury was unable to deliver any accredited programmes, except one TSP, using staff from HMP Drake Hall. Whilst the national prisoner allocation strategy envisaged prisoners transferring to HMP Shrewsbury would have already undertaken these programmes, in practice many had not. The prison had a significant population of sex offenders, and we were concerned that many of these prisoners had not had the opportunity to complete

the programmes they needed. However, HMP Shrewsbury, like many prisons, was able to run a number of non-accredited programmes, in this case including CARAT and A2Z motivational enhancement programme, S.O.R.I. restorative justice course, and resettlement/pre-release interventions supported by SOVA and NACRO and other non-government organisations such as Fresh Start New Beginnings (FSNB).

- 2.28 On both series of inspections, we saw evidence that prisons had recognised the gaps in accredited programmes and often sought to provide non-accredited alternatives, usually through education provision. HMP High Down also ran several non-accredited programmes, and both HMP Rye Hill and HMP/YOI East Sutton Park delivered non-accredited programmes to address offender confidence and assertiveness. It was recognised that these were not a direct equivalent and that offenders may still need to undertake the accredited programme at a later date.
- 2.29 HMP/YOI Isis had opened in July 2010 but no accredited offending behaviour programmes were in place at all until the TSP and PASRO programmes were introduced in April and June 2011 respectively. Furthermore, it was clear to us as well as to the prison managers that there had been significant errors in the predictions of need, particularly in the underestimate of the violent and gang-related characteristics of the population, and an overestimate of the need for education services.

The use of ROTL to support offender management objectives

- 2.30 No accredited programmes were provided at HMP & YOI East Sutton Park, but we were pleased to see that the prison was working in partnership with the local Probation Trust to deliver the TSP 'through the gate' on a temporary release basis. Where possible, this seemed a sensible arrangement. However, across all the establishments we inspected, we did not find the routine and systematic use of ROTL to deliver programmes as required to those prisoners who could be safely released. The limited use of ROTL for this purpose appeared to be a missed opportunity.

Conclusion

We noted in our earlier report that considerable progress needed to be made across the custodial estate before the NOMS vision of a 'joined-up sentence' would be realised, with Offender Management Units operating as a hub within the establishment. In our recent inspections we again found that Offender Management Units were well integrated into the organisational structure of some prisons and we were pleased to note some good practice in relation to MAPPA. In other prisons, however, the Offender Management Unit operated separately from core custodial functions and we were concerned about the separation of offender management and public protection and its impact on the management of prisoners who present a Risk of Harm to others.

Although P-NOMIS had been rolled out, the lack of strategic vision meant that its value had not been realised. Its current limited use was wasteful of the investment that had been made in a system that could contribute significantly, by coordinating information and processes, to the safe and effective management of prisoners.

Given the future planned transfer of responsibility for assessment and planning to offender supervisors, it was of some concern that their role was not fully understood in some establishments and that their training and development needs were not being fully met.

Whilst we recognise that most prisons were trying hard to run programmes within their resources, the provision was not always well matched to the needs of the offender population. We were particularly concerned that - across the custodial estate - there were significant gaps which meant that some prisoners were not able to access the required programmes. As a result they may spend longer in prison or be released without having undertaken the work they needed to reduce their Risk of Harm to others.

3. Offender Management in Practice – Assessment and sentence planning

Summary

This section contains our findings about the quality of assessment and sentence planning work in the cases we inspected.

Key findings

- Most 'in scope' prisoners were allocated to an offender manager and the majority had been assessed. Sentence planning boards were well used and sentence plans were usually in place, although there was little evidence that prisoners had been able to participate meaningfully in the sentence planning process.
- In some prisons duplicate sentence planning processes ran in parallel, with staff in various departments contributing to different plans, rather than making a single, timely contribution to one properly integrated plan. This was both wasteful and confusing.
- There was little evidence that offender managers had taken an active lead in the management of the case, with offender supervisors generally assuming responsibility for directing the work being undertaken.
- Issues about the prisoner's vulnerability were addressed in 82% of relevant cases. Offender Management Unit staff were aware of diversity issues and cited examples of actions taken to address particular needs. Records did not always reflect the work undertaken.
- Learning resources were generally available, but assessments and learning plans were not linked with OASys and the sentence plan, and were therefore unlikely to be readily accessible to the offender manager. As a result, the available resources were not always accessed or targeted effectively.

Allocation to offender supervisors

- 3.1 The NOMS *National Standards for the Management of Offenders 2007* were in operation until April 2011 and although most of the standards related to work by community offender managers, they included some standards relating to the offender supervisor role. In most establishments prisoners were allocated to an offender supervisor within the required two days of reception. There was no common system for allocating prisoners; some supervisors specialised in particular categories of cases (for example PPOs or high Risk of Serious Harm cases) whilst others had a generic caseload.

- 3.2 The period until the first contact with the prisoner varied. Many were interviewed on the first or second day, but in other cases allocation was largely an administrative process and we found that the offender supervisor had no meaningful contact with the prisoner for some weeks. However, 70% of cases met the National Standard for a first contact with the prisoner within ten days of sentence.
- 3.3 The National Standards did not specify the period between arrival at a subsequent prison and contact with the new offender supervisor, but the first contact with the prisoner took place within ten days in a similar proportion of cases.
- 3.4 Where an initial interview was undertaken with a member of the offender management team within a few days of arrival in the prison, it was often used productively, enabling prisoners to identify their needs and to be referred to resources such as health services, housing and education.
- 3.5 Whilst prison officers remained enthusiastic about their role as offender supervisor, the limitations of the time available to them continued to be a frustration. In most establishments, prison officers were at times allocated to other operational duties, which were prioritised over the time for acting as offender supervisor. Sometimes this was time that had been allocated to their work in the Offender Management Unit, reducing the resources available for this work. This was not an issue where offender supervisors were probation service staff.

Assessment and planning

- 3.6 The National Standard for offender management requires an offender manager to be allocated to 'in scope' prisoners within eight weeks of sentence if less than two years to release, or within 16 weeks if two years or more to release. Prompt allocation occurred in the majority of the cases we inspected.
- 3.7 The NOMS Offender Management Model also requires an assessment of the likelihood of reoffending, the Risk of Harm to others and a sentence plan to be completed on all prisoners 'in scope' of the model by the allocated offender manager in the community, using information obtained from the prison via the offender supervisor where relevant. In 42% of cases in the sample, this assessment was undertaken whilst the prisoner was at a previous establishment, and in these cases inspectors accessed the assessment and plan through the historical electronic record available to the current prison.
- 3.8 The initial assessment had been completed by the offender manager in 93% of cases, in line with the NOMS Offender Management Model. In nine cases it had been completed by the offender supervisor, presumably to ensure that the Offender Management Unit had a plan in place in the absence of an allocated offender manager.

Assessment and planning to minimise Risk of Harm to others

- 3.9 In the sample as a whole, a sufficient Risk of Harm screening had been completed in 83% of cases. Only 5% of cases had no initial screening at all, and 3% were

completed late. Of completed screenings 12% were inaccurate or based on insufficient information.

- 3.10 A sufficient full Risk of Harm assessment had been completed in 75% of the cases where required. Only 5% of relevant cases had no assessment at all. Of those completed, 3% were completed late, and there was insufficient information and analysis relating to previous and current offending in 16%. The analysis accurately reflected the levels of risk to children, the public, known adults, staff and other prisoners in 84% or more of assessments.
- 3.11 Risk of Harm issues were effectively communicated to other staff involved in 75% of cases, but only 56% of cases had a sufficient risk management plan. There was no plan at all in 5% of cases. Of those completed 7% were late, the roles and responsibilities of those involved were unclear in 27%, and planned responses were unclear or inadequate in 37%. Risk management plans were not shared with all relevant parties involved with the prisoner in 40% of cases.
- 3.12 Sentence plans included objectives to manage Risk of Harm in 82% of cases classified as High or Very High Risk of Serious Harm cases, but, worryingly, included objectives to manage child protection in only half of the relevant cases.

Assessment of the likelihood of reoffending

- 3.13 Overall, in 77% of cases there had been a sufficient assessment of the likelihood of reoffending using OASys. No assessment had been completed at all within six months of sentence in 14% of cases inspected, or within the National Standards timescale indicated above, in a further 9%. In 29%, offending-related factors were not sufficiently identified, and in 27%, the assessment contained generally unclear or insufficient evidence. Insufficient attention had been paid to positive and protective factors in the prisoners' life in 19%.
- 3.14 As we find in the community, there were examples of cases where offender managers had simply copied an out of date OASys without updating it. Some assessments contained sufficient offender details but lacked analysis of the information presented.

Assessment of diversity and vulnerability

- 3.15 In our meetings with Offender Management Unit staff, we discussed their approach to diversity and identification of factors that needed to be addressed to enable the prisoner to participate fully in work to address reoffending. We found that staff were generally aware of diversity issues and gave examples of approaches used in particular cases to address difficulties caused by poor basic skills and prisoners who were not fluent in English.
- 3.16 However, in 47% of files, we found no evidence that diversity issues and discriminatory and disadvantaging factors had been actively assessed, but this may be due to the recording issues to which previous reference has been made.
- 3.17 In 82% of those cases where there were concerns about vulnerability, appropriate arrangements were in place to support, and where possible, protect the prisoner.

The role of the offender manager

- 3.18 As noted above 96% of prisoners had been allocated an offender manager. However, there was little evidence in many case records that offender managers had taken an active lead in the management of the case. In some cases there was no evidence of initial communication from the offender manager to the offender to introduce themselves and seek to engage the individual in the sentence planning process, or to support any contact from the offender supervisor. With the exception of emails between some offender managers and supervisors, it was often not clear what contact, if any, offender managers had had directly with others involved with the prisoners. It might well be that offender managers had had more contact with staff in prisons than was apparent from prison records. Better use of P-NOMIS would improve communication and recording.
- 3.19 In some cases, we saw offender supervisors with a clear overview of the case, directing the work being undertaken. Some expressed frustration about poor communication from staff in Probation Trusts, although others had developed a good joint working relationship with their probation colleagues.
- 3.20 Sentence planning boards were well used in most establishments. Whilst some Probation Trusts did not routinely prioritise participation by offender managers, most did. Offender managers rarely chaired the sentence planning board but participated either in person or by telephone or occasionally by video link – an approach which can be used effectively.

Sentence plans in general

- 3.21 The minimum National Standards for prisoners serving over 12 months require little in relation to assessment and planning and are silent in relation to other, short-term prisoners. A sentence plan should be completed 16 weeks after sentence at the latest but only needs to be reviewed annually. As a result, information is not incorporated into the sentence planning where additional needs are identified, referrals made or interventions started or completed, until the next annual review.
- 3.22 For this reason, most establishments operated a separate internal sentence planning process running in parallel with the OASys assessment and sentence plan, usually undertaken by the offender supervisor. This enabled the Offender Management Unit to produce a plan for work to be undertaken in the prison quickly after the prisoner's arrival, without incurring the time delay of waiting for a sentence planning meeting involving the offender manager to take place. This was an inevitable consequence of the long timeframe permitted by the National Standard for the completion of a plan by the offender manager.
- 3.23 What this meant, however, was that these alternative plans were not based on a comprehensive assessment of all available information relating to the prisoner. In some cases, education or other departments had also put in place their own plan for work with the prisoner without any reference to information held by the Offender Management Unit or any overview of the full needs of the case and the overarching priorities for the prisoner's sentence. These practices detracted from the role of the Offender Management Unit in the overall management of the

prisoner's sentence and resulted in considerable duplication and waste of effort, and the potential for confusion for the prisoner and staff.

- 3.24 Assessment and sentence planning to address Risk of Harm and public protection is covered in Section 4 below.

Sentence plans in detail

- 3.25 OASys sentence plans were completed in 91% of cases. They were completed on time in 78%, and late in a further 13%. In 9% of cases there was no plan at all. Where completed, 78% of plans were informed by relevant assessments.
- 3.26 Overall, 94% of sentence plans contained objectives to address the likelihood of reoffending but these were outcome-focused and logically sequenced in only 55% and 47% of cases respectively. Only 31% described the planned levels of contact and only 48% set out the roles and responsibilities for all those involved with the case. Overall, we found sufficient attention was paid to the methods most likely to be effective with the prisoner in only 52% of cases. An enhanced level of interventions was planned for only 8 out of the 33 PPO cases in the sample. Objectives to promote community integration were included in 64% of cases.
- 3.27 As we have noted, it is not possible for us to make definitive comparisons with previous findings. However, there was some evidence to suggest that these aspects of sentence planning in the prisons we inspected were better than we found in those prisons we inspected previously. Nevertheless, there was still considerable room for improvement.
- 3.28 Sentence plans were shared with, or available to, other staff involved with the prisoner in three-quarters of cases. Surprisingly, however, OASys did not appear to have been specifically reviewed as part of the decision making process for transfer to open conditions in any of the relevant cases. Nor could we see evidence that OASys was used to inform decisions about categorisation or allocation. We saw this as an indication of the lack of integration of offender management in prison processes. This might be a problem with recording rather than OASys assessments being ignored.

Involvement in sentence planning

- 3.29 In the HMI Prisons' survey of prisoners in the establishments covered by this report, only half of all those who had a sentence plan felt they had been involved in its development. In 35% of the cases we inspected, there was no evidence that the prisoner had been enabled to participate meaningfully in the sentence planning process. This aspect of sentence planning appeared to have deteriorated since our previous inspections.
- 3.30 We could not see from the information available, what attention had been paid to individuals' learning styles, motivation and capacity to change. In some establishments, access to interventions was limited so that most prisoners tended to have the same plan, for example, 'attend education services'. Whilst this may have been a realistic reflection of what was available, it was an example of the lack of outcome focused objective setting.

3.31 Active contributions were made to sentence planning boards by offender managers in 72% of cases, and by offender supervisors in 77%. In contrast, contributions were made from personal/named officers or wing staff, learning and skills providers, CARAT staff, health services and security departments in less than a fifth of cases. Records suggested that personal/named officers were rarely engaged in the offender management process, and that greater use could be made of their role in the prison in supporting the delivery of sentence plans and the review of assessments.

Basic skills and link with education

3.32 Educational resources were available for those prisoners who wanted to use them, but there was not always a systematic approach to basic skills screening, so it was not clear that the prisoners who needed it most had access to learning. This information was therefore unlikely to be made available to offender managers and was not included in OASys assessments and sentence plans. We found evidence in Offender Management Unit files or in electronic files to which the unit staff had access, that a sufficient assessment of learning and skills had been carried out in only 57% of relevant cases, and learning plans were present in only 26% of relevant cases. In the majority of cases where there was a learning need it did not form part of the sentence plan. This did not appear a good use of resources.

Conclusion

Assessments and plans were generally completed, and many offender managers contributed to sentence planning boards. Nevertheless, with some notable exceptions, there was little sense of offender managers, offender supervisors and prisoners working together in the way envisaged by the offender management model.

In too few cases, sentence plans were based on outcome-focused objectives. There needed to be a shift from process driven targets (e.g. 'complete programme') to objectives formulated around the required changes in behaviour, attitudes and lifestyle (e.g. 'to be able to control temper better'). This change of approach would also help to put the OASys sentence plan at the core of the work with the prisoner, with the contributions of the various prison departments incorporated into a single, overarching plan.

In the main, offender managers were not driving the work with the prisoner during the custodial sentence. It may be that the aspiration of the Offender Management Model has been overtaken by increased demands on community based staff. The planned transfer of responsibility for assessment and planning to offender supervisors may be a pragmatic response to this reality – but it is one which needs to be matched by appropriate focus on the skills of offender supervisors and the resources available to them.

4. Offender Management in Practice – Delivering the sentence

Summary

This section contains our findings in relation to the work undertaken with the prisoners whose cases we inspected.

Key findings

- The standard of work on both public protection and child protection revealed by these inspections was not, overall, of sufficient quality.
- Changes in the prisoner's Risk of Harm to others were identified swiftly in 83% of cases and were acted on appropriately in 71%. However, assessments were reviewed and updated in less than half of the cases we inspected.
- We considered that insufficient progress had been made on the most significant offending related factors in half of all cases.
- MAPPA cases were actively identified and a good inter-departmental approach to risk management had been developed in most, although not all, prisons.
- Managers were not sufficiently involved in overseeing the work of offender supervisors with prisoners who presented a High Risk of Serious Harm to others.
- P-NOMIS was not used effectively across the prison as a case record and, in nearly half of the cases inspected, the Offender Management Unit records did not contain all the relevant documents.
- Individual establishments did not have sufficient resources to provide prisoners access to the interventions necessary to help them change their offending behaviour. Access to interventions did not appear to be driven by the sentence plan.
- Offender supervisors and other prison staff showed commitment to their work with prisoners. Most worked hard to motivate and support them and to reinforce positive behaviour.

Recording offender management

- 4.1 In our sample, Offender Management Unit records were well organised in the majority of cases, but in only just over half of the cases contained copies of all relevant documents or a clear record of all the work carried out. In some cases, we found good recording in Offender Management Unit files of progress made on accredited programmes, particularly where tutors had involved offender supervisors in end of programme three-way meetings and had provided good

quality post-programme reports that were copied on the Offender Management Unit file. This, where it occurred, provided the opportunity for the prison to maximise its investment in the accredited programme by ensuring that issues arising during the programme could be followed up in a timely manner.

- 4.2 As we observed earlier in this report, the electronic case record P-NOMIS had been rolled out to all prisons and had the potential to provide an effective means of recording the work undertaken by different prison departments with individual prisoners, as well as communicating concerns and observations about progress. It was not generally being used to maximum effect; as a result prisons were not always making use of all the available information to inform decisions about prison allocation or re-categorisation and in planning for eventual release. Moreover, it meant that offender managers were not routinely provided with information that may be significant in analysing risk and in preparing accurate and well-informed assessments. In our Offender Management Inspections in the community we are critical of such failures to record and communicate information as we believe they have a significant impact on managing an offender and protecting the public. The same principle applies to work in prisons.

Management of the Risk of Harm to others

- 4.3 Appropriate resources had been allocated throughout the sentence to address Risk of Harm in two-thirds of cases, but interventions were timed and sequenced according to Risk of Harm in only 52%. Whilst we accept that the timing of interventions within the prison system is dictated, in no small degree, by their availability within the particular institution, the limitations thereby placed on delivery have an impact on their effectiveness.
- 4.4 Potential and actual changes in Risk of Harm factors were anticipated in 70% of cases, and where they occurred, identified swiftly in 83% and acted on appropriately in 71%. Risk of Harm assessments were reviewed thoroughly in line with required timescales or following a change in circumstances in only 42% of cases. These findings suggest that the prisons were insufficiently reactive to changes in Risk of Harm once they occurred or seemed likely to occur and, furthermore, had not implemented the review processes which would enable them routinely to identify and check any changes in behaviour that might impact on the likely Risk of Harm.
- 4.5 We saw some good practice, including the early identification of MAPPA cases and communication with offender managers at various points during the sentence and prior to release. The involvement of offender managers in inter-departmental risk meetings, either in person or by submission of a report, helped to ensure that assessments were fully shared and prison staff made aware of trigger factors or risk indicators. Where prison staff were able to attend MAPPA meetings held in the community, this provided the opportunity for the meeting to review the offender's progress and risk level in the light of behaviour whilst in custody.
- 4.6 The standard of work on both public protection and child protection revealed by these inspections was not, overall, of sufficient quality.
- 4.7 Where relevant, multi-agency child protection procedures were used effectively to manage child protection in 78% of cases, but sufficient measures were not in

place in the prison to protect children from harm caused by the prisoner in more than one in ten cases.

- 4.8 In around one-third of cases where there was an identifiable victim or potential victim, we felt that greater priority needed to be given to victims' safety and to ensuring that the Risk of Harm to them was effectively managed.
- 4.9 There was insufficient management oversight of the offender supervisor's contribution to the assessment and planning for High and Very High Risk of Serious Harm cases in 59%, and the assessment and management of child protection issues in 51%. There was also insufficient oversight of the offender supervisors' ongoing work in 63% of High and Very High Risk of Serious Harm cases, and in 57% of child protection cases. Evidence of any managerial review within the Offender Management Unit was generally lacking in relation to these cases. Given that the standard of work on both public protection and child protection revealed by these inspections was not, overall, of sufficient quality, and the lack of confidence displayed by some offender supervisors in their ability to meet the requirements of their role, the added investment of some degree of management oversight would have been of considerable benefit.

Delivery of sentence plans

- 4.10 Overall, participation in activities to help reduce offending was based on the availability of resources, rather than on individual need. Some prisoners were therefore unable to access the programmes they needed to address their offending. We did see some cooperation at regional level to enable prisoners to be transferred appropriately, but this was limited. Although the level of resources available varied considerably from prison to prison, in too many of the cases we inspected insufficient relevant resources had so far been allocated to work addressing the individual's Risk of Harm to others or likelihood of reoffending.
- 4.11 In some establishments, access to interventions did not appear to be systematic, or driven by the sentence planning process, with prison departments identifying their own referrals through induction. Sufficient priority had been given to activities linked to the sentence plan in only 59% of cases.
- 4.12 Appropriate resources had been allocated throughout the sentence so far to address the likelihood of reoffending in only 68% of cases, and resettlement in 65%.
- Interventions had been:
- ▶ delivered in line with the sentence plan in only 48% of cases
 - ▶ timed and sequenced according to the likelihood of reoffending in 57%, and according to preparation for release in 49%
 - ▶ delivered in only 36% of PPO cases.
- 4.13 Where assessments had identified diversity issues, appropriate resources were allocated to address them in only 46% of cases. Diversity issues were taken into account in the delivery of interventions in only 53% of cases.
- 4.14 Eighty-two prisoners required a transfer to another establishment to access specific resources linked to sentence planning, and of these 34 had been moved and a further 19 were waiting for a planned move to take place. No move was

planned for the remaining 29. In almost all cases the move was required to access specific resources available at the alternative prison.

4.15 In only just over half of the cases inspected did either the offender manager or offender supervisor coordinate the input of other workers involved in the case, or ensure all elements of the sentence plan were delivered. There was sufficient communication between:

- ▶ the offender manager and other workers involved in the case in only 56% of cases
- ▶ all workers and the prisoner in 62% of cases
- ▶ the offender supervisor and other workers in the prison in 64%.

This meant that potentially vital information was not passed between relevant workers within the prison who were effectively operating in isolation as a result.

4.16 Our sample contained 148 cases where the sentence plan included delivery of an accredited programme. In 29% of cases the programme had already been delivered. However, of the remainder, there was no plan for delivery in place in 25%. Plans were in place to deliver the programme at the current prison in 30%, following transfer to another prison in 10%, and on licence after release in 6%. The required programme had not yet been delivered in one-quarter of cases because it was not run at all at the current prison, and in 28% of cases because it was not run frequently enough. Of the 148 cases, 40% required a thinking skills programme, 34% a sex offender programme, and 14% a substance misuse programme.

4.17 In nearly half of the cases we inspected, insufficient work had been undertaken to encourage the individual to take responsibility for their actions and decisions related to offending. In a similar proportion of cases, arrangements were in place to prepare prisoners thoroughly for interventions, and to reinforce the acquisition of new learning and/or skills after their delivery. Whilst these prisoners were being effectively contained during their imprisonment, the opportunity provided by a period in custody to focus on and change aberrant behaviour was thus, in a significant proportion of cases, being lost.

4.18 Similarly, in nearly two-thirds of cases sufficient action had been taken to retain and develop constructive links with the community, overcome practical obstacles to community reintegration, and promote the achievement of life skills.

4.19 Victim awareness and other social and life skills programmes were provided by the education department in some establishments. However, in half of the cases inspected, it was not clear whether victim awareness work had either been done or was planned for the future. There was little evidence in Offender Management Unit records of the impact of this work where it had been undertaken.

4.20 Given the pressures on their time, it was encouraging to find that offender supervisors had demonstrated a commitment to their work with the prisoner in three-quarters of cases, and they had motivated and supported them through the sentence, and reinforced positive behaviour in more than two-thirds. Indeed, the willingness of these prison staff to work to change the behaviour of the prisoners in their charge in our view made the constraints placed upon them the more frustrating. In relation to other casework staff in the prison, including education, psychology and drug/alcohol service staff, the picture was even more positive;

staff demonstrated a commitment to their work with the prisoner in 80% of cases, and had motivated and supported them in 77%, and reinforced positive behaviour in 73%. On the other hand, there was insufficient evidence in the cases inspected of ongoing support from offender managers.

Sentence plan reviews and progress

- 4.21 The NOMS National Standard required assessments and sentence plans to be reviewed annually, as a minimum, and yet only 49% of the cases inspected had a thorough review of the likelihood of reoffending at even this frequency. Only 37% of sentence plans were reviewed annually or when required following a change of circumstances, such as following a transfer to a different prison or completion of a sentence plan objective. However, when sentence plans were reviewed, more than 80% showed sufficient involvement of the prisoner, the offender manager, and offender supervisor. Other staff were involved in 42%.
- 4.22 Only 9% of prisoners had had three or more offender managers (including any PSR author), and 56% of cases had been managed by a single offender manager to date. However, delivery of the sentence plan had not been maintained in 37% of cases where there had been a change of offender manager.
- 4.23 We considered that insufficient progress had been made on the most significant offending-related factors in half of all cases. Good progress had been made on all significant factors in only 10%, and progress had been made on some but not all factors in 34%. These concerning results were not, in our opinion, surprising, considering our findings.
- 4.24 Where relevant, action been taken or plans were in place to ensure positive outcomes were sustainable beyond the custodial part of the sentence in only 54% of cases.
- 4.25 In relation to learning and skills development, 19% of prisoners had already gained a qualification whilst in custody, and 34% had made other relevant progress, including work towards a qualification.

Conclusion

Many staff in Offender Management Units were trying hard to support the aims of the offender management model in their work with individual prisoners. Unfortunately, as we noted earlier, prisons were too often unable to deliver the interventions required by their prisoners. Opportunities for transfer to other prisons were limited. The interventions delivered were driven more by the activities that were available than by the prisoner's assessment and sentence plan. As such, the work undertaken was less likely to be targeted on achieving the necessary change in behaviour.

The implementation of P-NOMIS had the potential to support effective offender management across the prison and to identify important information to communicate to offender managers. However, there would need to be a significant culture shift for change to be achieved. The effective use of P-NOMIS as a means of recording and communication needed to form part of the professional expectations and training for staff and not simply an exercise in IT training.

Glossary

<i>Accredited programme</i>	Structured courses for offenders which are designed to identify and reduce the factors related to their offending behaviour. Following evaluation, the design of the programmes has been accredited by a panel of experts
CARAT	Counselling, Assessment, Referral, Advice, Throughcare team. Substance misuse work within prisons
<i>Dynamic factors</i>	As distinct from <i>static factors</i> . <i>Dynamic factors</i> are the factors in someone's circumstances and behaviour that can change over time
ETE	<i>Employment, Training and Education</i> : Work to improve an individual's learning, and thereby to increase their employment prospects
FSNB	Fresh Start New Beginnings
HDC	Home Detention Curfew
HMI Prisons	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons
HMI Probation	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation
HMP	Her Majesty's Prison
<i>Interventions; constructive and restrictive interventions</i>	<p>Work with an offender which is designed to change their offending behaviour and to support public protection.</p> <p>A <i>constructive intervention</i> is where the primary purpose is to reduce <i>likelihood of reoffending</i>. In the language of <i>offender management</i> this is work to achieve the 'help' and 'change' purposes, as distinct from the 'control' purpose. A <i>restrictive intervention</i> is where the primary purpose is to keep to a minimum the offender's <i>Risk of Harm to others</i>. In the language of <i>offender management</i> this is work to achieve the 'control' purpose as distinct from the 'help' and 'change' purposes.</p> <p>Example: with a sex offender, a <i>constructive intervention</i> might be to put them through an accredited sex offender programme; a <i>restrictive intervention</i> (to minimise their <i>Risk of Harm</i>) might be to monitor regularly and meticulously their accommodation, employment and the places they frequent, whilst imposing and enforcing clear restrictions as appropriate to each case.</p> <p>NB Both types of intervention are important</p>
ISP	<i>Initial Sentence Plan</i> : All cases should have a sentence plan. Usually this will be contained within the Offender Assessment System format
IT	Information Technology
Likelihood of reoffending	An aspect of the assessment of future behaviour by an individual offender. A prediction of <i>likelihood</i> as distinct from the potential <i>Risk of Harm to others</i>
MAPPA	<i>Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements</i> : Probation, police, prison and other agencies working together locally to manage offenders who are of a higher <i>Risk of Harm to others</i>
NACRO	National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders. A crime reduction charity
NOMS	<i>National Offender Management Service</i> : The single agency responsible for both Prisons and <i>Probation Trusts</i>
OASys	<i>Offender Assessment System</i> : The nationally designed and prescribed framework for both Probation and Prisons to assess offenders, implemented in stages from April 2003. It makes use of both <i>static</i> and <i>dynamic factors</i>

<i>Offender management/offender management model</i>	A core principle of <i>offender management</i> is that a single offender manager takes responsibility for managing an offender through the period of time they are serving their sentence, whether in custody or the community. Offenders are managed differently depending on their <i>Risk of Harm</i> and what <i>constructive</i> and <i>restrictive interventions</i> are required. Individual intervention programmes are designed and supported by the wider 'offender management team or network', which can be made up of the <i>offender manager</i> , offender supervisor, key workers and case administrators. The Offender Management Model in custody has been implemented in phases; prisoners are described as 'in scope' or 'out of scope' of the model
<i>Offender supervisor</i>	Staff working within the prison who are assigned to prisoners who fall within the scope of the Offender Management Model
<i>PASRO</i>	<i>Prisons Addressing Substance Related Offending – an accredited programme</i>
<i>PPO</i>	<i>Prolific and other Priority Offender</i>
<i>P-NOMIS</i>	<i>Prison based electronic case recording system designed to support the management of offenders</i>
<i>Prison officer</i>	A member of staff employed by HM Prison Service to work directly with prisoners and to contribute to the running of the establishment. As part of their job, they may undertake the role of <i>offender supervisor</i>
<i>Probation officer</i>	This is the term for a 'qualified' offender manager. They manage offenders posing the highest risk of harm to the public and other more complex cases.
<i>Probation services officer</i>	This is the term for an offender manager who is not qualified as a probation officer. From 2010 they have been able to access locally determined training to 'qualify' as a PSO or to build on this to qualify as a probation officer. They may manage all but the most complex cases or those posing the highest risk of harm to the public depending on their level of training and experience
<i>Risk of Harm/Risk of Serious Harm</i>	Risk of Harm to others is the term generally used by HMI Probation to describe work to protect the public. In the language of offender management, this is the work done to achieve the 'control' purpose, with the offender manager/supervisor using primarily restrictive interventions that keep to a minimum the offender's opportunity to behave in a way that is a risk of harm to others. Risk of Serious Harm refers to the NOMS classification system
<i>ROTL</i>	Release on Temporary Licence
<i>Sentence plan</i>	A plan for managing the sentence. The Initial Sentence Plan should identify the <i>interventions</i> appropriate for the offender. The Review Sentence Plan reviews and records progress made
<i>SORI</i>	A restorative justice programme
<i>SOTP</i>	Sex Offender Treatment Programme
<i>SOVA</i>	Supporting Others Through Volunteer Action. A national charity which recruits and trains volunteers
<i>Static factors</i>	As distinct from <i>dynamic</i> factors. <i>Static</i> factors are elements of someone's history that by definition can subsequently never change (i.e. the age at which they committed their first offence)
<i>TSP</i>	Thinking Skills Programme
<i>YOI</i>	Young Offender Institution

APPENDIX Role of HMI Probation and Code of Practice

Information on the Role of HMI Probation and code of practice can be found on our website:

www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-probation

The Inspectorate is a public body. Anyone wishing to comment on an inspection, a report or any other matter falling within its remit should write to:

*HM Chief Inspector of Probation
6th Floor, Trafford House
Chester Road, Stretford
Manchester, M32 0RS*

© Crown Copyright

HM Inspectorate of Probation
6th Floor Trafford House
Chester Road
Stretford
Manchester
M32 0RS

Telephone 0161 869 1300

Alternative formats are available upon request

ISBN:978-1-84099-551-0